



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

52

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,493	06/14/2001	Pankaj K. Jha	0325.00482	7913
21363	7590	05/19/2005	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C. 24840 HARPER ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080			PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,493

Applicant(s)

JHA, PANKAJ K.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/4/04, 9/2/03, 6/27/02 and 3/2/02</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-20 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "cited reference Dietz et al. (Hereinafter Dietz) expressly or inherently does not disclose a CAM storing pointers for parameters of a network protocol, as presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "a CAM storing pointers for parameters of a network protocol", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is, "a database configured to store a pointer for each first parameter of a network protocol", see claim 1. Dietz discloses a database configured to store a pointer (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, figure 15) for each first parameter of a network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, figure 15), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor processing parameters of incoming packets with a pointer stored in CAM, as

Art Unit: 2154

presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "a network monitor processing parameters of incoming packets with a pointer stored in CAM", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is, "a processing circuit configured to process at least one of said first parameters an incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter", see claim 1. Dietz discloses a processing circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57) configured to process at least one of said first parameters an incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 16 – 34), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (3), "cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally by the network monitor using a pointer from the CAM and an incoming packet, as presently claimed". The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, "a network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally by the network monitor using a pointer from the CAM and an incoming packet", are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of

Art Unit: 2154

the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is “to present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter”, see claim 1. Dietz discloses limitations, to present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter a processing circuit (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 51 – 67), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (4), “cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor storing a pointer for parameters for a network protocol, as presently claimed”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, “network monitor storing a pointer for parameters for a network protocol”, are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is, “a second circuit configured to store a pointer for each first parameter least one first parameter said network protocol”, see claim 10. Dietz discloses a second circuit configured to store a pointer for each first parameter least one first parameter said network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 – 24, col., 25, lines 41 – 57, figure 15), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (5), “cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose a network monitor processing parameters in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor to produce a second parameter, and the network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor and the incoming packet, as presently claimed”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, “network monitor processing parameters in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor to produce a second parameter, and the network monitor presenting an outgoing packet produced internally in accordance with a pointer stored in the network monitor and the incoming packet”, are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is “process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter, and to present an outgoing packet containing the second parameter”, see claim 10. Dietz discloses process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14) and to present an outgoing packet containing the second parameter (e.g., col., 33, lines 51 – 67, col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14, figure 16), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Art Unit: 2154

Applicant argues (6), “cited reference Dietz expressly or inherently does not disclose an unidentified circuit framing an outgoing frame received from the network monitor to present a transmit frame to a second network, as presently claimed”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies, “an unidentified circuit framing an outgoing frame received from the network monitor to present a transmit frame to a second network”, are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). What is claimed is “a third circuit configured to frame said outgoing packet to present a transmit frame to a second network”, see claim 10. Dietz discloses a third circuit configured to frame said outgoing packet to present a transmit frame to a second network (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15), as claimed. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues, (7) “a next rejection be presented in a non-final office action due to large ambiguities in the current rejections”. The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. Applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, which the cited reference teach at several places. As per the claimed invention, the invention only accomplishes a circuit and an assembly (see claims 1 and 10). For clarification, Dietz et al., 6,665,725 (Hereinafter Dietz), discloses a circuit (e.g., circuit containing memory, registers, etc. devices, figure 10, col., 5, line 63 – col., 6, line 15), and an assembly (e.g., circuit containing

Art Unit: 2154

memory, registers, etc. devices, figure 10, col., 5, line 63 – col., 6, line 15), as claimed. Also, page 22, lines 14 –18 of the specification, clearly states, “While the invention has been particularly shown and described with reference to the preferred embodiments thereof, will be understood by those skilled in the art that various changes form and details may be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention”. Since, applicant's claims contain broadly claimed subject matter, it clearly reads upon the examiner's interpretation of the claimed subject matter. The addition of newly presented limitations, “plurality of framing circuits”, “plurality of de-framing circuits”, “a fourth circuit connected to said second circuit”, etc., is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Double Patenting

3. Applicant's submission of terminal disclosure to overcome double patenting rejection with copending application 09/881367, dated 11/24/2004 has been acknowledged.

Response to Amendment

4. The amendment filed 11/24/2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

Art Unit: 2154

a) addition of limitations of claim 20, “a fourth circuit connected to said second circuit and configured process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer”.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art to use and/or make the invention.

6. The specification does not contain subject matter containing any software or hardware to implement limitation “a fourth circuit connected to said second circuit and configured process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer”, as cited in claim 20.

Examiner has reviewed the specification (OCR whole document) and could not find support for the additional limitations as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2154

7. Claims 10, 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claims 10, 11 and 20 recites the limitations, "said first parameters". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dietz et al.
(Hereinafter Dietz).

11. As per claims 1 and 10, Dietz teaches a circuit and an assembly as follows:

a database configured to store a pointer for each first parameter of a network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, figure 15); and a processing circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57) configured to (i) process at least one of said first parameters an incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 33, lines 16 – 34, figure 16) and (ii)

Art Unit: 2154

present an outgoing packet containing said second parameter (e.g., col., 33, lines 51 – 67, figure 16),

first circuit configured to delineate a receive frame from a first network having a network protocol to produce incoming packet (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57, figure 15);

an second circuit configured to (i) store a pointer for each first parameter least one first parameter said network protocol (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15),

(ii) process at least one of said first parameters in said incoming packet in accordance with said pointer to produce a second parameter (e.g., col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14), (iii) present process an outgoing packet containing said second parameter (e.g., figure 16, col., 33, lines 51 – 67, col., 32, line 50 – col., 33, line 14), and

a third circuit configured to frame said outgoing packet to present a transmit frame to a second network (e.g., col., 21, lines 11 –24, col., 25, lines 41 - 57, figure 15).

12. As per claim 2, Dietz teaches the following:

database is further configured to store an offset and a length for said first parameter (e.g., col., 19, lines 1 – 23), and said processing circuit is further configured partition said incoming packet accordance with said offsets and said lengths extract said first parameters (e.g., col., 19, lines 16 – 61).

13. As per claim 3, Dietz teaches the following:

an interface configured to download said offsets, said lengths, and said pointers for storage in said database (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 57).

14. As per claim 4, Dietz teaches the following:

a parsing circuit configured to partition said incoming packet (e.g., figure 15, col., 32, lines 7 – 16); a plurality of peripheral blocks (e.g., col., 25, lines 41 – 58) each linked to said pointers and configured to perform a process involving said first parameters and an assembling circuit configured to generate said outgoing packet (e.g., figures 15-18B, col., 33, lines 16 – 34).

15. As per claim 5, Dietz teaches the following:

database is further configured to store second offset (e.g., col., 19, lines 1 – 23), a second length for each said second parameter of a second network protocol (e.g., col., 19, lines 16 – 61).

16. As per claim 6, Dietz teaches the following:

an interface connectable to a peripheral block external to said circuit (e.g., figure 15, col., 25, lines 41 - 57).

17. As per claim 7, Dietz teaches the following:

peripheral blocks are at least two circuits of addressable memory circuit, a parity circuit, a first-in-first-out circuit, time to live circuit, content comparison counter circuit, a value swapping circuit, a stuffing de-stuffing circuit, a cyclic redundancy checksum length construction generator circuit, synchronization circuit, a frame relay lookup circuit, a data link header error control connection identifier circuit, a protocol identification analysis circuit, a

Art Unit: 2154

point-to-point protocol verification circuit, parameter discard circuit, and a buffer circuit (e.g., col., 25, lines 3 – 38).

18. As per claim 8, Dietz teaches the following:

said peripheral block is configured to simultaneously processes a plurality of first parameters (e.g., col., 6, lines 1 – 15).

19. As per claim 9, Dietz teaches the following:

processing circuit is configured as only hardware (e.g., col., 25, lines 8 – 38).

20. As per claims 11-17, refer to above-rejected claimed subject matter of claims 1-10 and the cited reference used for rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Newly presented claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Ogawa et al. 5,936,966 (Hereinafter Ogawa).

23. As per claim 18, Dietz teaches the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Dietz does not specifically mention about a plurality of framing circuits.

Art Unit: 2154

Ogawa discloses a plurality of framing circuits (e.g., use of several circuits for framing, col., 3, lines 44 – 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz with the teachings of Ogawa in order to facilitate usage of a plurality of framing circuits means because the framing circuits would enhance the handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance the software to process information for the assembly.

24. Newly presented claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Wilford et al. 6,687,247 (Hereinafter Wilford).

25. As per claim 19, Dietz teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Dietz does not specifically mention about a plurality of de-framing circuits.

Wilford discloses a plurality of de-framing circuits (e.g., use of several circuits for deframing, col., 2, lines 59 – col., 3, line 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz with the teachings of Wilford in order to facilitate usage of a plurality of de-framing circuits means because the de-framing circuits would enhance the handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance the software to process information for the assembly.

26. Newly presented claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz in view of Yanagihara et al. 5,899,578 (Hereinafter Yanagihara).

Art Unit: 2154

*see
5/15/05*

27. As per claim ²⁰10, Dietz teach the claimed limitation as rejected under claim 10.

However, Dietz does not specifically mention about a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit and configured process at least one of the first parameters.

Yanagihara discloses a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit (e.g., figure 10 A) and configured process at least one of the first parameters (e.g., col., 1, lines 51 - 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dietz with the teachings of Yanagihara in order to facilitate usage of a fourth circuit connected to the second circuit and configured process at least one of the first parameters because the additional circuit would enhance the handling the information associated with the packet, and the packet related information would help enhance the software to process information for the assembly. The connection between two circuits would provide communication between two devices.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2154

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

May 12, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100